

1 **BRIDGET KENNEDY**
2 California State Bar No. 253416
3 FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF SAN DIEGO, INC.
4 225 Broadway, Suite 900
5 San Diego, California 92101-5030
6 Telephone (619) 234-8467
7 Facsimile (619) 687-2666
8 Bridget_Kennedy@fd.org

9
10 Attorneys for ALFREDO CHAVARRIA-SAUCEO

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

(HONORABLE BARRY TED MOSKOWITZ)

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Case No.08CR2259-BTM
12 Plaintiff,)
13 v.) DATE: August 15, 2008
14 ALFREDO CHAVARRIA-SAUCEO,) TIME: 1:30 p.m.
15 Defendant.)
16 _____) NOTICE OF MOTIONS AND MOTIONS TO:
17 TO: KAREN P. HEWITT, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY; AND) (1) COMPEL DISCOVERY AND PRESERVE
18 CALEB MASON, ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY:) EVIDENCE; and
19 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on August 15, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. or as soon thereafter as counsel may) (2) GRANT LEAVE TO FILE FURTHER
20 be heard, defendant, ALFREDO CHAVARRIA-SAUCEO, by and through his attorneys,) MOTIONS
21 BRIDGET KENNEDY, and Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc., will ask this Court to enter an order)
22 granting the following motions.

23 / / /
24 / / /
25 / / /
26 / / /
27 / / /
28 / / /

MOTIONS

Defendant, ALFREDO CHAVARRIA-SAUCEDO, by and through counsel, BRIDGET KENNEDY, Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc., asks this Court pursuant to the United States Constitution, the Rules of Criminal Procedure, and all other applicable statutes, case law, and local rules for an order

- (1) Compel Discovery and Preserve Evidence;
 - (2) Grant Leave to File Further Motions

This motion is based upon the instant motion and notice of motion, the attached statement of facts memorandum of points and authorities, the files and records in the above-captioned matter, and any and other materials that may come to this Court's attention prior to or during the hearing of these motions.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 6, 2008

s/ Bridget Kennedy
BRIDGET KENNEDY

Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc.
Bridget_Kennedy@fd.org
Attorneys for Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo

1 **BRIDGET KENNEDY**
2 California State Bar No. 253416
3 FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF SAN DIEGO, INC.
4 225 Broadway, Suite 900
5 San Diego, California 92101-5030
6 Telephone (619) 234-8467
7 Facsimile (619) 687-2666
8 Bridget_Kennedy@fd.org

Attorneys for ALFREDO CHAVARRIA-SAUCEO

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

(HONORABLE BARRY TED MOSKOWITZ)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,
v.
ALFREDO CHAVARRIA-SAUCEDO,
Defendant.

) Case No. 08CR2259-BTM
)) DATE: August 15, 2008
)) TIME: 1:30 p.m.
))
)) STATEMENT OF FACTS AND MEMORANDUM
)) OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT
)) OF MOTIONS OF ALFREDO CHAVARRIA-
)) SAUCEDO
))
))

I.

STATEMENT OF FACTS¹

19 The government asserts that Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo is an alien who was found in the United States
20 on June 13, 2008, after having been excluded, deported or removed from the United States, in violation of
21 18 U.S.C. § 1326.

22 | //

23 | //

24 //

26 1 The following statement of facts and any facts further cited in this motion are based on the
27 government's 18 U.S.C. §1326 complaint against Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo in no way
28 admits the truth of these facts nor their accuracy as cited in these motions. Further, he reserves the right to
challenge the truth and accuracy of these facts in any subsequent pleadings or during any further
proceedings.

II.

**THIS COURT SHOULD COMPEL DISCOVERY AND ORDER
THE PRESERVATION OF THE EVIDENCE**

At the time of this filing, the government has provided Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo with limited discovery -- in total 58 pages of discovery.

Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo moves for the production by the government of the following discovery and for the preservation of evidence. This request is not limited to those items of which the prosecutor knows, but rather includes all discovery listed below that is in the custody, control, care, or knowledge of any government agency. See generally Kyles v. Whitley, 514 U.S. 419 (1995); United States v. Bryan, 868 F.2d 1032 (9th Cir. 1989).

1. The Defendant's Statements. The Government must disclose to Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo all copies of any written or recorded statements made by the defendant; the substance of any statements (even if not written or recorded) made by him which the Government intends to offer in evidence at trial; any response by the defendant to interrogation; the substance of any oral statements which the Government intends to introduce at trial and any written summaries of the defendant's oral statements contained in the handwritten notes of the Government agent; any response to any Miranda warnings which may have been given to the defendant; and any other statements by the defendant. Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(a)(1)(A). The Advisory Committee Notes and the 1991 amendments to Rule 16.
2. Arrest Reports, Notes and Dispatch Tapes. The defense also specifically requests that all arrest reports, notes and dispatch or any other tapes and TECS records that relate to the circumstances surrounding his arrest or any questioning be turned over to him. This request includes, but is not limited to, any rough notes, records, reports, transcripts or other documents in which statements of the defendant or any other discoverable material is contained. This is all discoverable under Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(a)(1)(A) and Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963). See also Loux v. United States, 389 F.2d 911 (9th Cir. 1968). Arrest reports, investigator's notes, memos from arresting officers, dispatch tapes, sworn statements, and prosecution reports pertaining to the defendant are available under Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(a)(1)(B) and (C), Fed. R. Crim. P. 26.2 and 12(i). Preservation of rough notes is requested, whether or not the government deems them discoverable.

1 3. Brady Material. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests all documents, statements, agents' reports, and
2 tangible evidence favorable to the defendant on the issue of guilt and/or which affects the credibility
3 of the government's case. Impeachment and exculpatory evidence both fall within Brady's definition
4 of evidence favorable to the accused. United States v. Bagley, 473 U.S. 667 (1985); United States
5 v. Agurs, 427 U.S. 97 (1976).

6 4. Any Information That May Result in a Lower Sentence Under the Guidelines. The government must
7 produce this information under Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963).

8 5. The Defendant's Prior Record. Evidence of a prior record is available under Fed. R. Crim.
9 P. 16(a)(1)(D). Counsel specifically requests a complete copy of any criminal record.

10 6. Any Proposed 404(b) Evidence. To the extent that there is any such evidence, the government must
11 produce evidence of prior similar acts under Fed. R. Crim. P. 404(b) and "shall provide reasonable
12 notice in advance of trial . . . of the general nature" of any evidence the government proposes to
13 introduce under Fed. R. Crim. P. 404(b) at trial. See United States v. Vega, 188 F. 3d 1150, 1154-
14 1155 (9th Cir. 1999). Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests that such notice be given three weeks before
15 trial in order to give the defense time to adequately investigate and prepare for trial.

16 7. Evidence Seized. Evidence seized as a result of any search, either warrantless or with a warrant, is
17 discoverable under Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(a)(1)(E).

18 8. Request for Preservation of Evidence. The defense specifically requests that all dispatch tapes or
19 any other physical evidence that may be destroyed, lost, or otherwise put out of the possession,
20 custody, or care of the government and which relate to the arrest or the events leading to the arrest
21 in this case be preserved. This request includes, but is not limited to, individuals, the results of any
22 fingerprint analysis, the defendant's personal effects, the vehicle, and any other evidence seized from
23 the defendant or any third party. It is requested that the government be ordered to question all the
24 agencies and individuals involved in the prosecution and investigation of this case to determine if
25 such evidence exists, and if it does exist to inform those parties to preserve any such evidence.

26 9. Henthorn Material. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests that the Assistant United States Attorney
27 ("AUSA") assigned to this case oversee (not personally conduct) a review of all personnel files of
28 each agent involved in the present case, and produce to him any exculpatory information and

impeachment material at least two weeks prior to trial and one week prior to the motion hearing. See Kyles v. Whitley, 514 U.S. 437, 438 (1995) (holding that “the individual prosecutor has a duty to learn of any favorable evidence known to the others acting on the government’s behalf in the case, including the police”); United States v. Henthorn, 931 F.2d 29 (9th Cir. 1991); see also United States v. Jennings, 960 F.2d 1488 (9th Cir. 1992) (AUSA may not be ordered to personally conduct examination of records; appropriate government agency may review files and notify AUSA of contents as long as AUSA makes the determination regarding material to be disclosed); United States v. Herring, 83 F.3d 1120 (9th Cir. 1996) (accord). In addition, the defendant requests that if the government is uncertain whether certain information is to be turned over pursuant to this request, that it produce such information to the Court in advance of the trial and the motion hearing for an in camera inspection.

10. Tangible Objects. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests the opportunity to inspect, copy, and test, as necessary, all other documents and tangible objects, including photographs, books, papers, documents, alleged narcotics, fingerprint analyses, vehicles, or copies of portions thereof, which are material to the defense or intended for use in the government’s case-in-chief or were obtained from or belong to the defendant. Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(a)(1)(E). Specifically, Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests copies of his immigration file as well as any recordings of his alleged prior removal.

11. Expert Witnesses. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests the name, qualifications, and a written summary of the testimony of any person that the government intends to call as an expert witness during its case in chief. Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(a)(1)(G). Defendant requests the notice of expert testimony be provided at a minimum of two weeks prior to trial so that the defense can properly prepare to address and respond to this testimony, including obtaining its own expert and/or investigating the opinions, credentials of the government’s expert and a hearing in advance of trial to determine the admissibility of qualifications of any expert. See Kumho v. Carmichael Tire Co., 526 U.S. 137, 119 S.Ct. 1167, 1176 (1999) (trial judge is “gatekeeper” and must determine, reliability and relevancy of expert testimony and such determinations may require “special briefing or other proceedings”).

28 //

- 1 12. Impeachment Evidence. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests any evidence that any prospective
2 government witness has engaged in any criminal act whether or not resulting in a conviction and
3 whether any witness has made a statement favorable to the defendant. See Fed. R. Evid. 608, 609
4 and 613; Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963); United States v. Strifler, 851 F.2d 1197, 1201-1202
5 (9th Cir. 1988); Thomas v. United States, 343 F.2d 49, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1965).
- 6 13. Evidence of Criminal Investigation of Any Government Witness. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests
7 any evidence that any prospective witness is under investigation by federal, state or local authorities
8 for any criminal conduct. United States v. Chitty, 760 F.2d 425 (2d Cir. 1985).
- 9 14. Evidence of Bias or Motive to Lie. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests any evidence that any
10 prospective government witness is biased or prejudiced against him, or has a motive to falsify or
11 distort his or her testimony. Pennsylvania v. Ritchie, 480 U.S. 39, 57-58 (1987); United States v.
12 Strifler, 851 F.2d 1197, 1201-1202 (9th Cir. 1988).
- 13 15. Evidence Affecting Perception, Recollection, Ability to Communicate, or Truth Telling. The defense
14 requests any evidence, including any medical or psychiatric report or evaluation, that tends to show
15 that any prospective witness' ability to perceive, remember, communicate, or tell the truth is
16 impaired, and any evidence that a witness has ever used narcotics or other controlled substance, or
17 has ever been an alcoholic. See United States v. Strifler, 851 F.2d 1197, 1201-1202 (9th Cir. 1988).
- 18 16. Witness Addresses. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests the name and last known address of each
19 prospective government witness. See United States v. Cook, 608 F.2d 1175, 1181 (9th Cir. 1979)
20 (defense counsel has equal right to talk to witnesses). The defendant also requests the name and last
21 known address of every witness to the crime or crimes charged (or any of the overt acts committed
22 in furtherance thereof) who will not be called as a government witness. United States v. Cadet,
23 727 F.2d 1453 (9th Cir. 1984).
- 24 17. Name of Witnesses Favorable to the Defendant. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests the name of any
25 witness who made an arguably favorable statement concerning the defendant or who could not
26 identify his or who was unsure of his identity, or participation in the crime charged.

27 //

28 //

- 1 18. Statements Relevant to the Defense. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests disclosure of any statement
2 relevant to any possible defense or contention that he might assert. United States v. Bailleaux,
3 685 F.2d 1105 (9th Cir.1982). This includes recordings of any alleged deportation proceedings..
- 4 19. Jencks Act Material. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests production in advance of trial of all material,
5 including dispatch tapes, which the government must produce pursuant to the Jencks Act, 18 U.S.C.
6 § 3500 and Fed. R. Crim. P. 26.2. Advance production will avoid the possibility of delay at trial to
7 allow the defendant to investigate the Jencks material. A verbal acknowledgment that “rough” notes
8 constitute an accurate account of the witness’ interview is sufficient for the report or notes to qualify
9 as a statement under § 3500(e)(1). Campbell v. United States, 373 U.S. 487, 490-92 (1963). In
10 United States v. Boshell, 952 F.2d 1101 (9th Cir. 1991) the Ninth Circuit held that when an agent
11 goes over interview notes with the subject of the interview the notes are then subject to the
12 Jencks Act. See also United States v. Riley, 189 F.3d 802, 806-808 (9th Cir. 1999). Mr. Chavarria-
13 Saucedo requests pre-trial disclosure of such statements to avoid unnecessary recesses and delays
14 for defense counsel to properly use any Jencks statements and prepare for cross examination.
- 15 20. Giglio Information & Agreements Between the Government and Witnesses. Pursuant to Giglio v.
16 United States, 405 U.S. 150 (1972), Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests all statements and/or promises,
17 express or implied, made to any witness, in exchange for their testimony in this case, and all other
18 information which could be used for impeachment.
- 19 21. Agreements Between the Government and Witnesses. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests discovery
20 regarding any express or implicit promise, understanding, offer of immunity, of past, present, or
21 future compensation, or any other kind of agreement or understanding, including any implicit
22 understanding relating to criminal or civil income tax, forfeiture or fine liability, between any
23 prospective government witness and the government (federal, state and/or local). This request also
24 includes any discussion with a potential witness about or advice concerning any contemplated
25 prosecution, or any possible plea bargain, even if no bargain was made, or the advice not followed.
- 26 22. Informants and Cooperating Witnesses. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests disclosure of the names and
27 addresses of all informants or cooperating witnesses used or to be used in this case, and in particular,
28 disclosure of any informant who was a percipient witness in this case or otherwise participated in

1 the crime charged against Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo. The government must disclose the informant's
2 identity and location, as well as disclose the existence of any other percipient witness unknown or
3 unknowable to the defense. Roviaro v. United States, 353 U.S. 52, 61-62 (1957). The government
4 must disclose any information derived from informants which exculpates or tends to exculpate the
5 defendant.

6 23. Bias by Informants or Cooperating Witnesses. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests disclosure of any
7 information indicating bias on the part of any informant or cooperating witness. Giglio v. United

8 States, 405 U.S. 150 (1972). Such information would include what, if any, inducements, favors,
9 payments or threats were made to the witness to secure cooperation with the authorities.

10 24. Personnel Records of Government Officers Involved in the Arrest. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests
11 all citizen complaints and other related internal affairs documents involving any of the immigration
12 officers or other law enforcement officers who were involved in the investigation, arrest and
13 interrogation of Defendant. See Pitchess v. Superior Court, 11 Cal. 3d 531, 539 (1974). Because of
14 the sensitive nature of these documents, defense counsel will be unable to procure them from any
15 other source.

16 25. Training of Relevant Law Enforcement Officers. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests copies of all
17 written, videotaped or otherwise recorded policies or training instructions or manuals issued by all
18 law enforcement agencies involved in the case (United States Customs Service, Border Patrol, DHS,
19 Imperial Beach Sheriff's Department, etc.) to their employees regarding: (1) the informing of
20 suspects of their Constitutional rights; (2) the questioning of suspects and witnesses.

21 26. Residual Request. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo intends by this discovery motion to invoke his rights to
22 discovery to the fullest extent possible under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and the
23 Constitution and laws of the United States. The defendant requests that the government provide him
24 and his attorney with the above requested material sufficiently in advance of trial to avoid
25 unnecessary delay prior to cross examination.

26 // /

27 // /

28 // /

1 **III.**2 **MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE FURTHER MOTIONS**

3 To date, Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo and defense counsel have received 58 pages of discovery from the
4 government. It is anticipated that as new information comes to light, the defense will likely find it necessary
5 to file further motions. Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo requests a further opportunity to file further motions based
6 upon information gained through the discovery process.

7 **IV.**8 **CONCLUSION**

9 For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo respectfully requests that this Court grant these
10 motions.

11 Respectfully submitted,

12 Dated: August 6, 2008

13 /s/ Bridget Kennedy
BRIDGET KENNEDY

14 Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc.
Bridget_Kennedy@fd.org
Attorneys for Mr. Chavarria-Saucedo

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

BRIDGET L. KENNEDY
California State Bar No. 253416
FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF SAN DIEGO, INC.
225 Broadway, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92101-5008
(619) 234-8467/Fax: (619) 687-2666
E-Mail: bridget_kennedy@fd.org

Attorneys for Alfredo Chavarria-Saucedo

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

(HONORABLE BARRY T. MOSKOWITZ)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Case No. 08cr2259-BTM

Plaintiff,)
)

ALFREDO CHAVARRIA-SAUCEO

Defendant.

Case No. 08CR2259-BTM

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Counsel for Defendant certifies that the foregoing pleading is true and accurate to the best of her information and belief, and that a copy of the foregoing document has been served this day upon:

Jeffrey David Moore
Jeffrey.Moore@usdoj.gov,debra.huntley@usdoj.gov,efile.dkt.gc1@usdoj.gov

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: August 6, 2008

/s/ Bridget L. Kennedy
BRIDGET L. KENNEDY
Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc.
Attorneys for Alfredo Chavarria-Saucedo